

Madame Adélaïde, female political power, and the July monarchy.

The July monarchy was a crucial period in the history of modern France - her longest experiment with constitutional monarchy, and her most substantial attempt to reconcile this principle with the legacy of the French Revolution. Compared to other nineteenth-century French régimes the third republic, the first and second empires, even the Bourbon restoration it is also the most neglected. Some aspects of the July monarchy - its political thought and its contribution to the history of liberalism - have received scholarly attention over the last few decades. There are, however, far fewer recent works on the actual political history of the era. A substantial biography of Louis-Philippe, by Guy Antonetti, did appear in 1994, but less than half of it is devoted to the period after 1830, and its tone towards its subject is hostile throughout. The standard reference work for the July monarchy remains one written less than half a century after its fall, Paul Thureau-Dangin's seven-volume *Histoire de la monarchie de juillet*.¹

Reappraising the entire July monarchy would be a huge task, and is certainly not the purpose of this chapter. Instead, the focus here will be on one particular aspect of it, though it is a central one - the political partnership at its apex, between Louis-Philippe and his devoted, unmarried sister Adélaïde, from the July revolution through to Adélaïde's death on 31 December 1847. This involves a significant reassessment of how politics at the centre of the Orléanist régime was conducted. Because Louis-Philippe was such an active and visible king, he has always been seen as the dominant

figure of the July monarchy. Highly intelligent and terrifyingly loquacious, with an iron constitution, throughout his reign he exploited his prerogatives to the full, and especially the most important - those of choosing his ministers and directing foreign policy. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Louis-Philippe has consistently appeared as the principal player in his own reign.²

In one important area, however, this picture is incomplete. It ignores the critical policymaking role played from 1830 to her death by Adélaïde. Born in 1777 and four years younger than Louis-Philippe, Adélaïde was his companion throughout much of the emigration, and after 1808 rarely left his side. She is almost completely forgotten today – there are only two biographies of her, both popular.³ Yet in three areas she made a crucial contribution to the July monarchy. On 30th July 1830 it was she who accepted the crown from the representatives of revolutionary Paris on behalf of Louis-Philippe, who had gone into hiding. This was the single act that did most to found the Orléanist régime. During the reign itself, she exercised a constant influence on policy through daily private meetings with her brother. Finally, in the area of responsibility he guarded most jealously, foreign policy, Louis-Philippe delegated to Adélaïde the day-to-day handling of France's most important diplomatic relationship, that with Britain. Though Adélaïde wielded her power discreetly, well-informed contemporaries realized how much Louis-Philippe relied on her. Writing in his diary a few years after her death, Victor Hugo commented: 'She had shared his exile; to an extent she shared his throne.'⁴

Adélaïde's life was defined by four things: her father, her brother, her education and the French Revolution. Her father was Louis-Philippe-Joseph, duc d'Orléans,

notorious after 1792 as Philippe-Egalité. Although Philippe-Egalité's public reputation has never recovered from the dubious role he played during the Revolution, in private he was a devoted father, much loved by all his children, and especially Adélaïde, his only surviving daughter. In particular, he equipped them with a rigorous and avant-garde education supervised by his own mistress, the educationalist and disciple of Rousseau Mme de Genlis. By the age of seventeen, when she left Mme de Genlis' care, Adélaïde was far better educated than most women of her age and status.⁵

By November 1793, the Revolution had guillotined Adélaïde's father and forced her into exile. Most cruelly, the fact that Philippe-Egalité had sided with the Revolution made her an object of hatred to those who would otherwise have been her companions in misfortune, the royalist émigrés. This was crucial in shaping Adélaïde's political views, and her actions after 1814. Her father's regicide also ruined any hope of a suitable marriage after 1793. The Revolution thus made Adélaïde what she remained: a spinster whose emotional energies were concentrated on her elder brother Louis-Philippe, after 1808 her sole surviving sibling, who had provided her only security during these perilous years.

The remarkable closeness between brother and sister was only marginally diminished by Louis-Philippe's marriage in 1809 to Maria Amalia of the Two Sicilies, the future Queen Marie-Amélie. Indeed, Louis-Philippe once joked to Adélaïde that he had only started looking for a wife because he could not marry her: 'Various people have got it into their heads that....they should marry me off.....but I've replied....that before thinking of getting married, I needed to find a woman I could marry and who wanted to be married to me, that *unfortunately* you were my sister...but that if I wasn't your

brother, I'd get on with it straight away.'⁶ Adélaïde and Marie-Amélie soon became close, united by their mutual devotion to Louis-Philippe. A crucial, and insufficiently recognized, ingredient in Louis-Philippe's successes both before and after 1830 was the unfailing support of these two remarkable women.

The origin of Adélaïde's fascination with politics is unclear, but this was certainly well-developed by the time of the Bourbon restoration in 1814. As her friend, the great memoirist Mme de Boigne, put it: 'Nobody in the world, I think, has a more complete grasp of politics than [Madame Adélaïde]. ' Ideologically, Adélaïde was significantly more left wing than her brother; fiercely loyal to the memory of their father, she consistently defended the French Revolution, even, according to one source, 'going so far as to excuse even some of its excesses.'⁷ In particular, no doubt as a result of their hostility to her in the 1790s, Adélaïde hated the émigrés and their political offspring, the ultra-royalists of the restoration, and this dislike extended to her cousins of the elder Bourbon branch.⁸

The question of when, if at all, Louis-Philippe began conspiring to replace his cousins of the elder Bourbon branch after the restoration of 1814 remains controversial. In general, his strategy seems to have been to refrain from any overt acts of disloyalty to Louis XVIII and then Charles X, but to present himself with great care as a moderate and patriotic alternative should the rightward drift of government after 1820 lead once again to revolution. He certainly received advice from political allies, such as Talleyrand in June 1830, to hold himself in readiness for this possibility. It is, however, very unlikely that he actively plotted after 1815, simply because he did not

need to. In Chateaubriand's elegant formulation: 'Le duc d'Orléans conspired, not in fact but by consent.'⁹

All the eyewitness accounts agree that Louis-Philippe and his household were taken by surprise by Charles X's four ordinances, which sparked off the 1830 revolution, when the news reached them at their château at Neuilly, then a country village just west of Paris. Significantly, while Louis-Philippe kept his own counsel, Adélaïde immediately espoused the revolutionary cause, even apparently exclaiming: 'Ah! If only I had a sword!' In the meantime, it was decided that Louis-Philippe should go into hiding at a nearby Orléans property at Villiers, in case either side should try to take him hostage.¹⁰

It was in these circumstances that, on 30th July, the thirty-three-year-old journalist and future prime minister Adolphe Thiers arrived at Neuilly as the representative of several leading politicians to offer Louis-Philippe the crown. The government forces had been driven out of Paris, but the situation was extremely fluid. Charles X still had a viable army at St Cloud, and if he used it energetically or fell back on the royalist western provinces the outcome would be civil war. In the capital, on the other hand, the mood on the streets was increasingly for a republic, which alarmed those moderate politicians who had opposed Charles X yet were also haunted by the spectre of 1793 and 1794. It was on behalf of this group that Thiers came to seek out Louis-Philippe.

In Louis-Philippe's absence, Thiers was received by Marie-Amélie and Adélaïde. However, in the detailed account of what followed that Thiers left in his papers, he presents the ensuing conversation as entirely between himself and Adélaïde. Thiers

began by stressing that the political situation was now wide open, and that Louis-Philippe needed immediately to come forward. Finally, he appealed to Adélaïde's own courage: 'I cannot hide from you that you will to overcome great perils. But you need perils. They are titles to the crown.'¹¹

Whether deliberately or not, Thiers struck the right note. 'Touched above all by this last consideration', he later wrote, '[Mme Adélaïde] rose and said: 'If you think that the adhesion of our family can be of use to the revolution, we give it gladly. A woman is nothing in a family. She can be compromised. I am ready to go to Paris. What happens to me there is in God's hands. I will share the fate of the Parisians....'¹²

It will never be entirely clear whether this response was spontaneous, or had been concerted beforehand with Louis-Philippe. It is possible that Louis-Philippe anticipated that an appeal to take power might come, but that not wishing to compromise himself too soon, arranged for Adélaïde to give a message of support instead. It is also entirely possible, perhaps even likely, that Adélaïde's response to Thiers was spontaneous; she had committed herself to the revolution days before, whereas her brother, often indecisive in moments of crisis, had not. In particular, she triumphantly turned to her advantage the restrictions her sex placed on her by giving assurances on her brother's behalf that, coming from a woman, were entirely deniable. This was shrewd, but also required some courage; had Charles X emerged victorious in July 1830, she would surely have faced some sort of vengeance.

However it came about, Adélaïde's intervention was crucial, and Thiers immediately recognized it as such. As he put it in his famous reply to her: 'Today, Madame, you

have gained the crown for your house.’¹³ It was on the basis of Adélaïde’s promise, which Thiers and all his colleagues accepted as a sufficient guarantee, that the plan was set on foot to launch Louis-Philippe’s candidature for the throne, culminating on 9th August 1830 with his proclamation as King of the French. By her actions on 30th July, Adélaïde played a decisive part in the foundation of the July Monarchy.

After 1830, Adélaïde took pains to project herself to the public in the conventional aristocratic female roles of patroness of charities and devoted aunt to her brother’s children. In reality, however, her key function was political, as her brother’s closest adviser, particularly on foreign affairs. She did not attend the council of ministers; instead, Louis-Philippe reserved for her two hours of the evening in his study, between 10pm and midnight, where he would discuss past and plan future policy with her. As a rule, nobody else was present at these meetings. One of the few who sometimes was, the Intendant of the Civil List Montalivet, has left a remarkable description of them, which implies strongly that Louis-Philippe’s policymaking role during the July Monarchy was not his alone, but a joint enterprise with his sister. After the king’s dinner, Montalivet recalled:

Madame Adélaïde’s hour had arrived at last; she hurried to join her brother, with some needlework in her hand, and took a seat beside him; silent when a piece of work absorbed all her brother’s attention, she was always happy when the king broke off to think out loud both before her and with her. Then she was no longer the silent witness and passive confidante.....at this hour of the evening, when the king belonged wholly to her, she took her turn to speak, generally addressing questions in the order the king assigned, but sometimes bringing up subjects of her own. In this way, through this intimate communication, mingled two streams of thought drawn from the same source, retaining, through all the events of their diverse and agitated lives, a remarkable common basis.....¹⁴

Given her closeness to her brother and the fact that apart from this passage no record has survived of her late-night conversation with him, it is difficult to recreate Adélaïde's political role after 1830 precisely or to determine when her views differed from the king's. Her main task, which she accomplished successfully at least until 1840, was to second her brother's extremely wide-ranging interpretation of the royal prerogative, and to ensure that he, and not the deputies or ministers, played the leading part in politics. To her, the ministers were simply auxiliaries to the king, supplementing rather than replacing his efforts. As she lamented to a confidant during a ministerial crisis in 1836: '[The king] can't do everything, he needs instruments, and alas that's what he lacks.'¹⁵ Yet she never committed the error of thinking, as had Charles X, that the king could change these instruments at will, or go on using them once they had lost the confidence of the Chambers. As she put it in 1839, when Louis-Philippe's trusted prime minister Molé lost an election, making his resignation inevitable: 'In the spirit of his loyalty and constitutional principles, our beloved king will submit and conform to the country's will.'¹⁶ If she drew the demarcation line between the king's powers and those of the ministers and Chambers distinctly in favour of the former, she wholeheartedly accepted the basic rules of the parliamentary game.

It is easier to reconstruct Adélaïde's influence on foreign than on domestic policy, because here substantial written evidence has survived. From the beginning of his reign Louis-Philippe delegated to her the day-to-day management of France's most important diplomatic relationship, that with England. Adélaïde handled this through an almost daily correspondence with two successive French ambassadors to London who, almost certainly not coincidentally, were her personal friends - Talleyrand from

1830 to 1834, and from 1834 to 1840 Talleyrand's protégé, the former Napoleonic soldier and diplomat General Horace Sébastiani. Some of her letters to Talleyrand were published in 1890; those to Sébastiani - 235 in all - have until now remained unused in the Orléans papers in the Archives Nationales.¹⁷ It is clear that Adélaïde wrote in the king's name, and that this was understood by all concerned. She made this explicit in a moment of anger to Sébastiani, when he failed to reply to one of her letters: 'I confess, your silence towards me, at such an important juncture.....and especially after my letter which gave you the king's positive opinion and decision, is painful and incomprehensible.'¹⁸

If it is difficult to distinguish between Adélaïde's foreign policy views and those of Louis-Philippe in these letters, it is hardly surprising, since the instructions she gave had by definition been agreed beforehand in her evening meetings with the king. To all intents and purposes, she was expressing a joint policy. This was based firmly on the premise that England was France's natural ally, both on ideological and geopolitical grounds. As she put it to Sébastiani in December 1835: 'I am convinced like you that England is our sincere friend, and desire everything that can consolidate and strengthen our union with her, because I feel it's as much in our interest as hers.'¹⁹

This so-called 'first Entente Cordiale' was vehemently attacked in France at the time, and has often been so since, as a complete diplomatic surrender to Britain, and a policy of peace at any price. Yet on many major issues, such as the question of intervention in the civil war in Spain, the July Monarchy - and Adélaïde - steered a very different course from their ally. For example, writing to Sébastiani in June 1836 Adélaïde made it clear that her loyalty to the Entente was not unconditional: 'Certainly

we want alliance and union with England, frankly and decidedly, but on her part she must also consult us and concert her actions with us, and march in step with us.²⁰

If Louis-Philippe and Adélaïde were at one over foreign policy, their differences over domestic affairs, while small, were significant. Here, Louis-Philippe was appreciably more conservative than his sister, and inclined towards a policy of order - or, as contemporaries termed it, of *résistance*. Adélaïde, on the other hand, found the methods of the *résistance* divisive, and was concerned about their effect on her brother's popularity. She disliked Casimir Périer, the leading early exponent of *résistance*, and was only reconciled to Guizot at the end of her life. It is no coincidence that in the intermittent diary she kept the passages expressing fears that Louis-Philippe had lost confidence in her occur during Périer's and Guizot's ministries.²¹

The politicians Adélaïde did support were essentially of the centre-left - Molé, Pasquier, Dupin, Marshal Gérard and her friend Sébastiani. While just as determined to preserve the political and social order as Périer and Guizot, this grouping believed in using more flexible methods. As Sébastiani elegantly put it, they were practitioners of 'resistance without rigidity.'²² The high point of their influence came during Molé's ministry of 1836-39, with its policy of national reconciliation symbolized by the amnesty for political detainees of May 1837. Adélaïde strongly supported Molé, and his ministry marked the high-water mark of her power. His fall marked the beginning of her eclipse; although she continued to advise her brother regularly, after 1840 she increasingly lost ground to Guizot, particularly in foreign affairs. Growing ill-health played a part in her grudging acceptance of this. When Sébastiani and Pasquier,

alarmed by the growing immobilism of the régime, begged her in 1847 to persuade Louis-Philippe to dismiss Guizot, she replied that she was simply too exhausted to do so.²³ Adélaïde died on 31st January 1847; had she lived, one can only speculate what her advice to Louis-Philippe would have been in February 1848.

There is one further important aspect to Adélaïde's political role. This is how it was perceived by public opinion, and in particular how this was affected by her being a woman. From the early 1830s she began to be attacked, in newspapers and cartoons, both for interfering unjustifiably in public life, and for her allegedly debauched private life. This campaign reached its height in 1838 and 1839, as a reaction to Adélaïde's supposed influence over the Molé ministry. It was led by the legitimist journal *La Mode*, which in the spring of 1838 published an article dramatically entitled: 'The Hidden Power Visible to the Naked Eye':

Open all the newspapers that have not sold themselves to the ministry; for some time they have written about nothing else but a hidden force, an elusive influence, a mysterious power that hampers all government business and throws a multitude of unconstitutional spokes in the wheels of the machinery of the state.

Nobody dares call this secret power by its real name, and we know very well the reason why; because it is generally supposed to be where it has never been. But we...know exactly where it lies, and see it not on the throne, but next to it.....Yes, Madame Adélaïde, that is the name of the mysterious influence which holds sway above the head of M. Molé.....Nothing is decided, nothing is done, without taking Madame Adélaïde's advice: she is the nymph Egeria of the Tuileries, she gives on anything and everything.....In a word, Madame Adélaïde does not reign, but she governs.²⁴

La Mode did not limit its attacks to Adélaïde's political role. It consistently dropped hints that she was having an affair with - or was even secretly married to - one of Louis-Philippe's aides-de-camp, General Atthalin.²⁵ No reliable evidence has ever surfaced to support this contention. Since Adélaïde's rough skin and reddish

complexion, in fact an inheritance from her father, was assumed to be the product of a fondness for drink, she was regularly pilloried as an alcoholic. In May 1833, the author of a slanderous pamphlet about Adélaïde's private life was brought to trial, in closed session to protect her honour. As a result, it is unclear what the allegations against her were.²⁶

All these themes were taken up in cartoons as well as words. Before the September laws imposed preliminary censorship on them, Adélaïde was a regular target of caricaturists. In several, she was portrayed as swigging from a bottle or clutching it to her bosom. In others, she was shown surrounded by a brood of illegitimate children, including, in a broad hint at incest, some with Louis-Philippe's features. The most remarkable cartoon of Adélaïde, although circulated in France, was published in Brussels in 1833. This portrayed her literally as the power behind the throne. The seated king is represented addressing a crowd of deputies while Adélaïde, crouching behind, manipulates him by a system of hidden pulleys. Out of the side of his mouth, Louis-Philippe whispers to her: 'Don't pull the wrong string, Madame!'²⁷ The image is striking, and further evidence that, to the better-informed newspapers and caricaturists, Adélaïde's extensive role in policymaking was an open secret.

Adélaïde's gender clearly played an essential role in these attacks. At first sight, the campaign against her seems further proof of the argument that hostility to powerful women in this era was driven by a perception that they had transgressed the limits of the domestic 'private sphere' reserved for women into the 'public sphere' of politics, an exclusively male preserve. For their detractors, it was natural that this perversion of the traditions of their sex should be mirrored in a debauched private life - hence, in Adélaïde's case, their insistence on her alcoholism, incest and illicit progeny.²⁸

This approach, however, needs qualification. As the pioneering collections of essays edited by Clarissa Campbell Orr, *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837* and *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815* argue, in reality the dividing line, at least for well-born women, between the 'public' and 'private' spheres was more porous than has up until now been supposed. At the highest level, a queen consort had an important say in public appointments, often extending beyond her household or the court. In countries where a reigning queen was permitted, of course, she had all the normal powers of a head of state.²⁹

Problems arose, however, when a woman who was not actually a reigning queen became heavily involved in policymaking. This clearly was the case with Adélaïde. Trespassing on this masculine domain, particularly in the open and direct way she did, made her highly vulnerable to public attack. The contrast with Marie Amélie, who kept well out of politics and was rarely lampooned either in cartoons or in print, is striking.³⁰

Adélaïde was pilloried partly, but not solely, because she was a woman. The opposition press preyed on her because, regardless of her sex, they disliked her political views. Sometimes, they attacked them openly. At others, they used a method that, then as now, has always proved effective in discrediting a foe - sexual slander. It is significant that the most sustained assault on Adélaïde came from the legitimist *La Mode*, which clearly knew of her profound hatred for the elder Bourbons, as well as her specific role in July 1830. For the republican press, which did not have this particular political reason to detest her, she was generally far less of a target.

Comparison between Adélaïde and her near-contemporary, Marie Antoinette, reveals a similar picture. As a particularly high-profile and powerful queen, Marie Antoinette became the object of an exceptionally violent campaign of pornographic pamphlets and cartoons, accusing her of rampant sexual promiscuity, especially incest and lesbianism. The most common conclusion is that she was vilified because the increasing influence she acquired went well beyond traditional gender boundaries.³¹ Yet as Vivian Gruder has recently and convincingly argued, the scurrilous attacks on Marie Antoinette only became a flood after 1789, when she took up an unpopular political position against the Revolution. In the struggle that ensued, the queen's opponents turned on her with every weapon they could, including the stock repertory of sexual smears. As Gruder comments, pornography was merely 'a handmaiden to politics, following in its path, an instrument in a preceding and larger political combat.'³² Adélaïde was attacked in the same way, less because she was a woman *per se*, than because her political choices made her enemies.

To conclude, Adélaïde d'Orléans clearly played a crucial political role in the July monarchy, and all the more remarkable because she was a woman. Was this role constructive, or destabilizing? On the one hand, her interpretation of the royal prerogative, like her brother's, gave significantly more power to the crown than many politicians were prepared to accept. Her forceful, and above all unaccountable, presence next to the throne, often exacerbated deep-seated suspicions of royal power in a political nation whose memories of Charles X were still fresh. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Adélaïde ever urged Louis-Philippe to appoint or sustain a ministry in defiance of a clear majority of deputies, as Charles X had done. Of the July monarchy's two most successful prime ministers, Molé and Guizot, she enthusiastically

supported the former, and was reconciled to the latter once he had made it clear that he did not see the throne, in his own words, as 'an empty chair.'³³ To her credit, more than many other leading figures of her day she saw the need for national reconciliation as well as order. Adélaïde d'Orléans played an important part in the development of constitutional monarchy in France. Fortunately for her, she did not live to see its ultimate failure.

1 HAC Collingham with RS Alexander, *The July Monarchy: a Political History, 1830-1848* (London 1988); DH Pinkney, *The French revolution of 1830* (Princeton, NJ, 1972) and *Decisive years in France, 1840-1847* (Princeton, NJ, 1986); M Price, *The perilous crown: France 1815-1848* (London 2007); G Antonetti, *Louis-Philippe* (Paris 1994); P Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet* (7 vols, Paris 1884-92).

2 See, for example, Collingham and Alexander, *The July monarchy*, pp.95-98.

³ R Arnaud, *Adélaïde d'Orléans (1777-1847)* (Paris 1908); D Paoli, *Madame Adélaïde: soeur et égérie de Louis-Philippe* (Paris 2016).

4 Victor Hugo, *Journal 1830-1848* éd. H Guillemin (Paris 1954), p.312.

5 On Philippe-Egalité and Mme de Genlis, the best recent biographies are E Lever, *Philippe-Egalité* (Paris 1996), et G de Broglie, *Madame de Genlis* (Paris 1985).

6 Louis-Philippe to Adélaïde d'Orléans, 31 January 1806, Archives Nationales, 300 AP(IV) 8, pièce 62.

7 *Mémoires de la comtesse de Boigne, née d'Osmond: récits d'une tante* (2 vols, Paris, Mercure de France, 1999), vol.2, p.328; Comte de Montalivet, *Fragments et Souvenirs* (2 t, Paris 1899-1900), t.1, pp.15-16.

8 See, for example, Louise d'Orléans to Adélaïde d'Orléans, s.d., AN 300 AP(IV) 18, 'Madame Adélaïde. Lettres recues de Marie-Amélie et de ses enfants, 1815-1829', dossier 19, p.167.

9 AN 300 AP(III) 73, Journal de Vatout, 1830, pièce 63, p.31, 'Juin 1830'; Vicomte de Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* (3 vols, Paris, Livre de Poche, 1973), vol.2, p.346.

10 AN 300 AP(III) 73, Journal de Vatout, 1830, pièce 63, p.29, '28 juillet 1830'

11 BN Nouvelles acquisitions françaises 20601, Papiers Adolphe Thiers, t.1, Correspondance 1830-1834. 'Notes sur les événements de 1830. Visite de M Thiers à Neuilly pour offrir la couronne au duc d'Orléans Note dictée par lui.' Fos 88-89.

12 Ibid, fos. 89-90.

13 Ibid.

14 Montalivet, *Fragments et Souvenirs*, vol.1, pp.16-18.

15 Adélaïde d'Orléans to General Sébastiani, 6th February 1836, AN 300 AP(III) 959, pièce 234.

16 Adélaïde d'Orléans to Sébastiani, 8th March 1839, ibid, pièce 372.

- 17 The correspondence between Mme Adélaïde et Talleyrand is published in Comtesse de Mirabeau, *Le prince de Talleyrand et la maison d'Orléans* (Paris 1890), and by F Masson, 'Lettres du prince de Talleyrand et de Mme de Dino à Mme Adélaïde', *Nouvelle Revue Rétrospective* t.15 (1901), pp.145-68, 217-40, 337-60, 385-408 et t.16 (1902) pp.49-65. Mme Adélaïde's letters to Sébastiani are in AN 300 AP(III) 959.
- 18 Adélaïde d'Orléans to Sébastiani, 2nd June 1835. AN 300 AP(III) 959, pièce 206.
- 19 Adélaïde d'Orléans to Sébastiani, 11 December 1835, *ibid* pièce 225.
- 20 Adélaïde d'Orléans to Sébastiani, 26th June 1836, *ibid* pièce 261.
- 21 See, for example, AN 300 AP(III) 6, Mme Adélaïde (1777-1847). Dossiers 37, 38 (25th February 1832).
- 22 Sébastiani to Thiers, 5th March 1836, BN, nouvelles acquisitions françaises 20606, vol.6, Correspondance 1836, M-S, fo.191.
- 23 Montalivet, *Fragments et Souvenirs*, vol. 2, pp. 86-87.
- 24 *La Mode*, 34-35, janvier-juin 1838, 9^{ème} livraison, pp.237-38.
- 25 See, for example, *La Mode*, 34-35, janvier-juin 1838, 9^{ème} livraison, pp.213-16.
- 26 *Le Charivari*, le 31 janvier 1839, 8^{ème} année, no.31; *La Mode*, le 29 février 1840, 38-39, janvier-juin 1840, p.261; Arnaud, *Adélaïde d'Orléans*, pp.295-96.
- 27 BN, Cabinet des Estampes, Qb-1 (1833)-FOL, M112331.
- 28 See L Hunt ed, *Eroticism and the body politic* (Baltimore, Maryland 1991), p.5; J Landes, *Women and the public sphere in the age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca, New York 1988). For a detailed analysis containing many examples, see A Corbin, J Lalouette et M Riot-Sarcey eds, *La femme dans la cite, 1815-1871* (Grane 1997). For the July monarchy in particular see J Burr Margadant, 'Gender, vice and the political imaginary: reinterpreting the failure of the July Monarchy, 1830-1848', *American Historical Review* vol. 104, no.5 (December 1999), pp.1461-96.
- 29 C Campbell-Orr ed, *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: royal patronage, court culture and dynastic politics* (Manchester et New York 2002), pp.34-36, et *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: the role of the consort* (Cambridge 2004).
- 30 For this aspect of Marie-Amélie, see J Burr Margadant, 'Representing Queen Marie-Amélie in a "bourgeois" monarchy', *Historical Reflections* (summer 2006), vol.32, no.2, pp.421-51.
- 31 See L Hunt, 'The many bodies of Marie Antoinette: political pornography and the problem of the feminine in the French Revolution', in L Hunt ed, *Eroticism and the body politic*, pp.108-30; S Maza, *Private lives and public affairs: the causes célèbres of prerevolutionary France* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1993) pp. 207-10; C Thomas, *La reine scélérate: Marie Antoinette dans les Pamphlets* (Paris 1989).
- 32 V Gruder, 'The question of Marie Antoinette: the queen and public opinion before the Revolution', *French History* vol. 16, no.3 (September 2002), p.298.
- 33 F Guizot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de mon temps* (8 vols, Paris 1858-67), vol. 8, p.84.

